



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/544,704

04/07/2000

Yossef Tsuria

U013185-5

9892

140

7590

05/27/2004

LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

EXAMINER

ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/544,704	Applicant(s) TSURIA, YOSSEF	
	Examiner Kaveh Abrishamkar	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment, Paper No. 10, filed on March 11, 2004. The applicant has added new claims 29 and 30, which have been incorporated in the new Office action. Presently pending claims are 1-30.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on March 11, 2004, Paper. No. 10, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

The applicants in regards to claims 1-12 and 14 argue that the cited prior art [Linnartz U.S. Patent 6,314,518] does not teach receiving "a signal indicating that a new watermark definition is to be used." This argument is not found persuasive. The actual signal that is received is not defined to perform any function but inform the reader that there is a watermark to be examined in the electronic representation. Linnartz discloses that the system provides "detection of the watermark, and communicates the result back to the receiving device." This communication is a signal that provides the receiving device knowledge of a new watermark (new watermark definition) (column 2 lines 10-15). Furthermore, Linnartz discloses "a decoder device for use in the arrangement is characterized in that the linking means are arranged for communicating with the receiver device for transmitting the watermark information" (column 2 lines 24 – 30).

This "watermark information" can be interpreted as being new watermark information that is being communicated to the receiver (receiving a signal) so that the receiver can examine the electronic representation with the watermark information in store.

The applicant in regards to claims 1 – 9, 13, and 15-28 argue that the prior art of Linnartz (U.S. Patent 6,314,518) in combination with Bloom et al. (U.S. Patent 6,332,194) do not teach "receiving a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining a electronic representation." This argument is not found persuasive. As stated above, the actual signal that is received is not defined to perform any function but inform the reader that there is a watermark to be examined in the electronic representation. Linnartz discloses that the system provides "detection of the watermark, and communicates the result back to the receiving device." This communication is a signal that provides the receiving device knowledge of a new watermark (new watermark definition) (column 2 lines 10-15). Furthermore, Linnartz discloses "a decoder device for use in the arrangement is characterized in that the linking means are arranged for communicating with the receiver device for transmitting the watermark information" (column 2 lines 24 – 30). This "watermark information" can be interpreted as being new watermark information that is being communicated to the receiver (receiving a signal) so that the receiver can examine the electronic representation with the watermark information in store. This new "watermark information" could be a second watermark definition disclosed by bloom. The signal containing watermark information that is generated when a watermark is detected and sent to a receiver should function the same regardless of when the watermark is

Art Unit: 2131

inserted or how many watermarks are present. Therefore, the combination of Linnartz and Bloom seem logical as Linnartz generates and sends watermark information and signals to a receiver device when a watermark is detected whether it has one watermark or two as delineated by Bloom.

Therefore, the examiner respectfully asserts that the cited prior art does teach or suggest the subject matter "receiving a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representation" broadly recited in the independent claims 1,10,17, 22 and 27. The dependent claims 2-9,11-16,18-21, and 23-26, and 28-30 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on the independent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action (Paper No. 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 10-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Linnartz (U.S. 6,314,518).

Regarding claim 10, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner for examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, the examiner comprising:

a watermark definition store operative to store a watermark definition (column 1 lines 10-11, column 2 lines 1-19, Fig.1 item 13, column 3 lines 62-65) ;

watermark examination apparatus operatively associated with the watermark definition store and operative to examine an electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the watermark definition stored in the watermark definition store (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22);and

a watermark definition signal receiver operative to receive a signal indicating that a new watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representation and to store the new watermark definition in the watermark definition store (column 1 lines 5-16, column 2 lines 1-19, column 3 lines 58-65).

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark definition comprises an indication of a location, within each electronic representation to be examined, at which a watermark, if present, is to be found (column 2 lines 20-31).

Claim 12 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark definition comprises an indication of a watermarking method according to which each electronic representation to be examined is to be examined for a watermark (column 2 lines 20-31, column 3 lines 58-65, column 4 lines 7-10, column 6 lines 66-67, column 7 lines 36-42).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark examiner also comprises a watermark storage memory for storing at least one watermark definition (Fig 1. column 3 lines 58-65), and

the watermark definition signal receiver is operative to retrieve the new watermark definition from the watermark storage memory in response to the received signal (Fig 1. column 3 lines 58-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 –9, 13, and 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linnartz (U.S. 6,314,518) in view of Bloom et al. (U.S. 6,332,194).

Regarding claim 1, Linnartz discloses:

A method for examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, the method comprising:

examining at least a first electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with a first watermark definition (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22).

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, and then examining at least a second electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the second watermark definition. Bloom teaches the process of inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column 4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device

whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom. The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the second watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Regarding claim 17, Linnartz discloses:

A method for altering an electronic representation of an item having a watermark, the method comprising:

providing a first electronic representation comprising a first watermark, the first watermark corresponding to a first watermark definition (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22);

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, and then examining at least a second electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the second watermark definition. Bloom teaches the process of inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column

Art Unit: 2131

4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom. The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the second watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Linnartz does not explicitly describe a second watermark definition, and therefore does not explicitly altering the first electronic representation to comprise a second watermark corresponding to the second watermark definition. Following the logic applied above in describing the use of a second watermark definition in combination with the system delineated by Linnartz, it is obvious to follow the teachings of Linnartz to alter the first electronic representation to comprise a second watermark taught by Bloom. Linnartz teaches the altering of an electronic representation to comprise a watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the method of altering the electronic representation to comprise a watermark provided by Linnartz to alter the electronic representation to comprise the second watermark described by Bloom. This would provide the benefit of redundancy and would provide a more secure and robust watermark system that could fallback onto an alternate watermark if the first watermark is compromised, altered, or tampered.

Regarding claim 22, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark alteration system for altering an electronic representation of an item having a watermark, the system comprising:

a watermark definition signal receiver for receiving a signal indicating that a watermark definition is to be used; and

watermark alteration apparatus for altering an electronic representation.

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations. Bloom teaches the process of inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column 4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom.

The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the second watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Linnartz teaches the altering of an electronic representation to comprise a watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31), but does not explicitly state altering the state to comprise a second watermark as taught by Bloom. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the method of altering the electronic representation to comprise a watermark provided by Linnartz to alter the electronic representation to comprise the second watermark described by Bloom. This would provide the benefit of redundancy and would provide a more secure and robust watermark system that could fallback onto an alternate watermark if the first watermark is compromised, altered, or tampered.

Regarding claim 27, Linnartz discloses:

A signal for indicating to a watermark examiner that a definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, the signal comprising:

A representation of a watermark definition

Linnartz does not explicitly describe the receiving of a signal indicating that a second watermark definition is to be used for examining electronic representations, and then examining at least a second electronic representation of an item for a watermark in accordance with the second watermark definition. Bloom teaches the process of inserting a second watermark into a data representation (column 3 lines 24-37, column 4 lines 6-40, column 6 lines 65-67). Linnartz teaches a system comprising a decoder device containing a decoder and a detector. There is also a linking means for communicating watermark information between the detector and the control means (column 2 lines 5-15). This system can communicate supplemental watermark information and therefore should be able to provide information to the decoder device whether or not to consider the second watermark outlined by Bloom. The detector device outlined by Linnartz could then examine the second watermark instead of the first watermark. This would provide a more robust system of watermarking which is more resistant to tampering. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the second watermark taught by Bloom in conjunction with the system outlined by Linnartz to provide a more robust watermarking system which is able to receive signals regarding watermarks, and is able to examine a second watermark if desired.

Claim 2 is rejected applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, comprising controlling access to an electronic representation. Linnartz does not

explicitly describe controlling access to the second electronic representation based on a result of examining at least a second electronic representation step. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation that is used to create a second watermark that is inserted into the data representation. Linnartz teaches an embodiment of the receiver device that secures the communications against tampering (column 2 lines 32-41). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the access control system delineated by Linnartz on the to control access to the second electronic representation described by Bloom to achieve a more secure and robust communication between sender and receiver.

Claim 3 is rejected applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item of a watermark. Linnartz describes one electronic representation, but does not explicitly describe a second electronic representation. Bloom describes a scenario where the first and second electronic representations are identical (column 7 lines 1-8). The addition of the second electronic representation adds another layer of security to the invention of Linnartz in that it now provides redundant watermarks, in case the first watermark is tampered with or altered. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the system taught by Linnartz with the two identical electronic representations delineated by Bloom to create a more secure and redundant watermark system that is more resistant to tampering and alteration.

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of receiving and decoding signals by using the disclosed receiver and decoder device (column 2 lines 31). Also, Linnartz delineates a separate control signal that can direct the receiver to perform certain actions including instructions to examine a watermark based on a definition that can be supplied in the control signal. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation of a watermark definition. Using the logic used above in rejecting claim 1, after the combination of the system of Linnartz with the second watermark of Bloom, it is necessary to communicate the second watermark definition in order to examine and recognize the watermark inserted in the data. Linnartz has a system to communicate this watermark definition through use of its control signal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second watermark definition of Bloom in the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data.

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and also comprising:

retrieving the second watermark definition from a storage device in response to the received signal (Fig 1. column 3 lines 58-65).

Art Unit: 2131

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and also comprising computing the second watermark definition in response to the received signal (column 3 lines 45-47, column 5 lines 42-67, column 6 lines 1-38).

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and wherein the first watermark definition and the second watermark definition each comprises an indication of a location, within each electronic representation to be examined, at which a watermark, if present, is to be found (column 2 lines 20-31).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and wherein the first watermark definition and the second watermark definition each comprises an indication of a watermarking method according to which each electronic representation to be examined is to be examined for a watermark (column 2 lines 20-31, column 3 lines 58-65, column 4 lines 7-10, column 6 lines 66-67, column 7 lines 36-42).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 1 and wherein the signal comprises authentication information for establishing that the signal originates from an authentic source (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62), and

the receiving step also includes:

verifying the authentication information to determine whether the authentication information is correct and rejecting the received signal if the authentication information is determine to be incorrect, thereby causing the first watermark definition to be used for examining if the authentication information is incorrect (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62).

Claim 29 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Linnartz does not explicitly describe examining in accordance with the second watermark definition and not examining in accordance with the first watermark definition. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation of a watermark definition. Using the logic used above in rejecting claim 1, after the combination of the system of Linnartz with the second watermark of Bloom, it is necessary to communicate the second watermark definition in order to examine and recognize the watermark inserted in the data. Linnartz has a system to communicate this watermark definition through use of its control signal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second

watermark definition of Bloom in the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data. The electronic representation then would be examined in accordance with the second watermark definition and not the first. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second watermark definition of Bloom in the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data.

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the signal comprises a representation of a watermark definition (column 1 lines 5-16, column 2 lines 1-31, column 3 lines 58-65).

However, Linnartz does not explicitly describe that this signal represents a second watermark definition. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation of a watermark definition. Using the logic used above in rejecting claim 1, after the combination of the system of Linnartz with the second watermark of Bloom, it is necessary to communicate the second watermark definition in order to examine and recognize the watermark inserted in the data. Linnartz has a system to communicate this watermark definition through use of its control signal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second watermark definition of Bloom in

Art Unit: 2131

the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data.

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the watermark definition signal receiver is also operative to compute a watermark definition in response to the received signal (column 3 lines 45-47, column 5 lines 42-67, column 6 lines 1-38). Linnartz does not explicitly describe a second watermark definition. But following the logic used in rejecting claim 1 and claim 13, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill that the method for computing a watermark definition in response to a signal delineated by Linnartz, can be used to compute the definition for a second watermark definition described by Bloom.

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejected claim 10. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A watermark examiner according to claim 10 and wherein the signal comprises authentication information from establishing that the signal originates from an authentic source (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62), and

the watermark signal receiver also includes:

signal verification apparatus operative to verify the authentication information to determine whether the authentication information is correct and to reject the received

signal if the authentication information is determine to be incorrect, thereby causing the first watermark definition to be used for examining if the authentication information is incorrect (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62).

Claim 30 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 10. Linnartz does not explicitly describe examining in accordance with the second watermark definition and not examining in accordance with the first watermark definition. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation of a watermark definition. Using the logic used above in rejecting claim 1, after the combination of the system of Linnartz with the second watermark of Bloom, it is necessary to communicate the second watermark definition in order to examine and recognize the watermark inserted in the data. Linnartz has a system to communicate this watermark definition through use of its control signal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second watermark definition of Bloom in the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data. The electronic representation then would be examined in accordance with the second watermark definition and not the first. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the control signal of Linnartz to communicate the second watermark definition of Bloom in the signal in order to allow the decoder to recognize and examine the watermark in the data.

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 17 and wherein said altering step comprises:
altering the first electronic representation to no longer comprise the first watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31).

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 17 and also comprising:
examining at least a second electronic representation for the second watermark (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22).

Claim 23 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 22. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A system according to claim 22 and wherein said altering comprises:
altering the first electronic representation to no longer comprise the first watermark (column 1 lines 5-15, column 2 lines 1-31).

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 22. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A system according to claim 22 and also comprising:

watermark examining apparatus for examining at least a second electronic representation for the second watermark (Fig. 5, column 2 lines 1-31, column 4 lines 60-67, column 6 lines 39-43, column 7 lines 21-43, column 8 lines 43-49, column 9 18-22).

Claim 28 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 27. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A signal according to claim 27 and also comprising:

authentication information for establishing that the signal originates from an authentic source (column 2 lines 33-41, column 8 lines 57-62).

Claim 20 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 19. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item of a watermark. Linnartz describes one electronic representation, but does not explicitly describe a second electronic representation. Bloom describes a scenario where the first and second electronic representations are identical (column 7 lines 1-8). The addition of the second electronic representation adds another layer of security to the invention of Linnartz in that it now provides redundant watermarks, in case the first watermark is tampered with or altered. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the system taught by Linnartz with the two identical electronic representations delineated by Bloom to

create a more secure and redundant watermark system that is more resistant to tampering and alteration.

Claim 21 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 20. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses:

A method according to claim 19 and also comprising:
controlling access to an electronic representation.

Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, comprising controlling access to an electronic representation. Linnartz does not explicitly describe controlling access to the second electronic representation based on a result of examining at least a second electronic representation step. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation that is used to create a second watermark that is inserted into the data representation. Linnartz teaches an embodiment of the receiver device that secures the communications against tampering (column 2 lines 32-41). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the access control system delineated by Linnartz on the to control access to the second electronic representation described by Bloom to achieve a more secure and robust communication between sender and receiver.

Claim 25 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 24. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item of a watermark. Linnartz describes one electronic representation, but does not explicitly describe a

second electronic representation. Bloom describes a scenario where the first and second electronic representations are identical (column 7 lines 1-8). The addition of the second electronic representation adds another layer of security to the invention of Linnartz in that it now provides redundant watermarks, in case the first watermark is tampered with or altered. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to combine the system taught by Linnartz with the two identical electronic representations delineated by Bloom to create a more secure and redundant watermark system that is more resistant to tampering and alteration.

Claim 26 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 24. Furthermore, Linnartz discloses a method of examining an electronic representation of an item for a watermark, comprising controlling access to an electronic representation. Linnartz does not explicitly describe controlling access to the second electronic representation based on a result of examining at least a second electronic representation step. Bloom delineates a second electronic representation that is used to create a second watermark that is inserted into the data representation. Linnartz teaches an embodiment of the receiver device that secures the communications against tampering (column 2 lines 32-41). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to use the access control system delineated by Linnartz on the to control access to the second electronic representation described by Bloom to achieve a more secure and robust communication between sender and receiver.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 703-305-8892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KA
05/20/04


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100